

1 CLEMENT SETH ROBERTS (SBN 209203)  
croberts@orrick.com  
2 BAS DE BLANK (SBN 191487)  
basdeblank@orrick.com  
3 ALYSSA CARIDIS (SBN 260103)  
acaridis@orrick.com  
4 ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP  
The Orrick Building  
5 405 Howard Street  
San Francisco, CA 94105-2669  
6 Telephone: +1 415 773 5700  
Facsimile: +1 415 773 5759  
7  
8 SEAN M. SULLIVAN (*pro hac vice*)  
sullivan@ls3ip.com  
9 COLE RICHTER (*pro hac vice*)  
richter@ls3ip.com  
10 LEE SULLIVAN SHEA & SMITH LLP  
656 W Randolph St., Floor 5W  
Chicago, IL 60661  
11 Telephone: +1 312 754 0002  
Facsimile: +1 312 754 0003  
12  
13 *Attorneys for Sonos, Inc.*

14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA,  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

GOOGLE LLC,  
Plaintiff and Counter-defendant,  
v.  
SONOS, INC.,  
Defendant and Counter-claimant.

Case No. 3:20-cv-06754-WHA  
Related to Case No. 3:21-cv-07559-WHA  
**SONOS, INC.'S ADMINISTRATIVE  
MOTION TO FILE UNDER SEAL RE  
SONOS'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY  
JUDGMENT REGARDING GOOGLE'S  
CONTRACT-RELATED CLAIMS**

1     **I. INTRODUCTION**

2                 Pursuant to Civil Local Rules 7-11 and 79-5, Sonos, Inc. (“Sonos”) hereby respectfully  
 3 submits this Administrative Motion to Seal (“Administrative Motion”) in connection with  
 4 Sonos’s Motion for Summary Judgment Regarding Google’s Contract-Related Claim (“Sonos’s  
 5 Motion”). Specifically, Sonos seeks to file under seal the information and/or document(s) listed  
 6 below:

<b>DOCUMENT</b>	<b>PORTIONS TO BE SEALED</b>	<b>DESIGNATING PARTY</b>
Sonos’s Motion	Portions highlighted in blue	Sonos
Sonos’s Motion	Portions highlighted in green	Sonos and Google
Exhibit 1 to Kwasizur Declaration	Entire Document	Sonos and Google
Exhibit 1 to Schmidt Declaration	Entire Document	Sonos
Exhibit 2 to Kolker Declaration	Entire Document	Sonos and Google
Exhibit 3 to Kolker Declaration	Entire Document	Sonos
Exhibit 4 to Kolker Declaration	Entire Document	Sonos
Exhibit 5 to Kolker Declaration	Entire Document	Sonos
Exhibit 6 to Kolker Declaration	Entire Document	Sonos
Exhibit 7 to Kolker Declaration	Entire Document	Sonos
Exhibit 8 to Kolker Declaration	Entire Document	Sonos
Exhibit 12 to Kolker Declaration	Entire Document	Sonos

21     **II. LEGAL STANDARD**

22                 Civil Local Rule 79-5 requires that a party seeking sealing “establish[] that the document,  
 23 or portions thereof, are privileged, protectable as a trade secret or otherwise entitled to protection  
 24 under the law” (*i.e.*, is “sealable”). *See* Civil L.R. 79-5(b). The sealing request must also “be  
 25 narrowly tailored to seek sealing only of sealable material.” *Id.*

26                 “Historically, courts have recognized a ‘general right to inspect and copy public records  
 27 and documents, including judicial records and documents.’” *Kamakana v. City & Cty. of  
 28 Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178 (9th Cir. 2006) (quoting *Nixon v. Warner Commc’ns, Inc.*, 435

1 U.S. 589, 597 & n.7 (1978)). Accordingly, when considering a sealing request, “a ‘strong  
 2 presumption in favor of access’ is the starting point.” *Id.* (quoting *Foltz v. State Farm Mutual  
 3 Auto. Insurance Co.*, 331 F.3d 1122, 1135 (9th Cir. 2003)).

4 The Ninth Circuit has recognized that two different standards may apply to a request to  
 5 seal a document – namely the “compelling reasons” standard or the “good cause” standard.  
 6 *Blessing v. Plex Sys., Inc.*, No. 21-CV-05951-PJH, 2021 WL 6064006, at \*12 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 22,  
 7 2021) (citing *Ctr. for Auto Safety v. Chrysler Grp., LLC*, 809 F.3d 1092, 1096-97 (9th Cir.  
 8 2016)). The compelling reasons standard applies to any sealing request made in connection with  
 9 a motion that is “more than tangentially related to the merits of a case.” *Id.* A party seeking to  
 10 seal materials submitted with a motion that is “more than tangentially related to the merits of the  
 11 case” must demonstrate that there are “compelling reasons” to keep the documents under seal.  
 12 *WhatsApp Inc. v. NSO Grp. Techs. Ltd.*, 491 F. Supp. 3d 584, 596 (N.D. Cal. 2020) (citing *Ctr.  
 13 for Auto Safety*, 809 F. 3d at 1101-1102). What constitutes a compelling reason is left to the  
 14 “sound discretion of the trial court.” *Ctr. for Auto Safety*, 809 F.3d at 1097 (quoting *Nixon*, 435  
 15 U.S. at 599).

16 Under the compelling reasons standard, “a court may seal a record only if it finds a  
 17 ‘compelling reason’ to support such treatment.” *Blessing*, 2021 WL 6064006, at \*12. In applying  
 18 the “compelling reasons” standard, the Ninth Circuit has found appropriate the sealing of  
 19 documents where court records could be used “as sources of business information that might  
 20 harm a litigant’s competitive standing.” See *Ctr. for Auto Safety*, 809 F.3d at 1097. “Confidential  
 21 business information in the form of ‘license agreements, financial terms, details of confidential  
 22 licensing negotiations, and business strategies’ satisfies the ‘compelling reasons’ standard.”  
 23 *Hetland v. LendingTree, LLC*, No. 19-CV-02288-JSC, 2021 WL 2313386, at \*1 (N.D. Cal. May  
 24 3, 2021) (quoting *Exeltis USA Inc. v. First Databank, Inc.*, Case No. 17-cv-04810-HSG, 2020  
 25 WL 2838812, at \*1 (N.D. Cal. June 1, 2020)).

### 26 III. THE COURT SHOULD SEAL SONOS’S CONFIDENTIAL MATERIAL

27 The portions of Sonos’s Motion highlighted in blue and green, and the exhibits listed  
 28 above, contain references to Sonos’s confidential business information and trade secrets,

1 including Sonos's research and development processes. The specifics of how these  
 2 functionalities and processes operate is confidential information that Sonos does not share  
 3 publicly. Thus, public disclosure of such information may lead to competitive harm as Sonos's  
 4 competitors could use these details regarding the architecture and functionality of these products  
 5 to gain a competitive advantage in the marketplace with respect to their competing products.  
 6 Additionally, some of the green highlighted portions of the Motion include terms to confidential  
 7 agreements that are not public. Those same agreements are Exhibit 1 to the Kwasizur Declaration  
 8 and Exhibit 2 to the Kolker Declaration. Disclosure of this information would harm Sonos's  
 9 competitive standing by giving Sonos's competitors highly sensitive information about Sonos's  
 10 business dealings with other entities. A less restrictive alternative than sealing the portions of  
 11 Sonos's Motion and the exhibits indicated in the table above, would not be sufficient because the  
 12 information sought to be sealed is Sonos's confidential business information and trade secrets and  
 13 is integral to Sonos's legal arguments. See Declaration of Clem Roberts in Support of  
 14 Administrative Motion filed concurrently herewith, ¶ 4.

15 **IV. CONCLUSION**

16 In compliance with Civil Local Rule 79-5(d) and (e), unredacted versions of the above-  
 17 listed documents accompany this Administrative Motion and redacted versions are filed publicly.  
 18 A proposed order is being filed concurrently herewith. For the foregoing reasons, Sonos  
 19 respectfully requests that the Court grant Sonos's Administrative Motion.

20

21 Dated: February 6, 2023

ORRICK HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP  
 and  
 LEE SULLIVAN SHEA & SMITH LLP

22

By: /s/ Clement S. Roberts  
 Clement S. Roberts

23

Attorneys for Sonos, Inc.

24

25

26

27

28